

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF MARYLAND  
SOUTHERN DIVISION**

---

Anthony Schools,

Plaintiff,

v.

PMAB, LLC; and DOES 1-10, inclusive,

Defendants.

---

:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:

Civil Action No.: \_\_\_\_\_

**COMPLAINT**

For this Complaint, the Plaintiff, Anthony Schools, by undersigned counsel, states as follows:

**JURISDICTION**

1. This action arises out of Defendants' repeated violations of the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1692, et seq. ("FDCPA"), violations of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act, 47 U.S.C. § 227, et. seq. ("TCPA"), and the invasions of Plaintiff's personal privacy by the Defendants and its agents in their illegal efforts to collect a consumer debt.

2. Supplemental jurisdiction exists pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1367.

3. Venue is proper in this District pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b), in that the Defendants transact business in this District and a substantial portion of the acts giving rise to this action occurred in this District.

**PARTIES**

4. The Plaintiff, Anthony Schools ("Plaintiff"), is an adult individual residing in Gaithersburg, Maryland, and is a "consumer" as the term is defined by 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(3), and is a "person" as defined by 47 U.S.C.A. § 153(39).

5. Defendant, PMAB, LLC (“PMAB”), is a North Carolina business entity with an address of Two Lake Point Plaza, 4135 South Stream Boulevard, Suite 400, Charlotte, North Carolina 28217, operating as a collection agency, and is a “debt collector” as the term is defined by 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(6), and is a “person” as defined by 47 U.S.C.A. § 153(39).

6. Does 1-10 (the “Collectors”) are individual collectors employed by PMAB and whose identities are currently unknown to the Plaintiff. One or more of the Collectors may be joined as parties once their identities are disclosed through discovery.

7. PMAB at all times acted by and through one or more of the Collectors.

### **ALLEGATIONS APPLICABLE TO ALL COUNTS**

#### **A. The Debt**

8. A financial obligation (the “Debt”) was allegedly incurred to an original creditor (the “Creditor”).

9. The Debt arose from services provided by the Creditor which were primarily for family, personal or household purposes and which meets the definition of a “debt” under 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(5).

10. The Debt was purchased, assigned or transferred to PMAB for collection, or PMAB was employed by the Creditor to collect the Debt.

11. The Defendants attempted to collect the Debt and, as such, engaged in “communications” as defined in 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(2).

#### **B. PMAB Engages in Harassment and Abusive Tactics**

12. Beginning in or around October of 2013, PMAB contacted Plaintiff in an attempt to collect the Debt from “Ebony” (the “Debtor”), who is unknown to Plaintiff.

13. During all times mentioned herein, PMAB called Plaintiff on his cellular telephone using an automatic telephone dialing system (“ATDS”) and/or by using a prerecorded or artificial message.

14. PMAB used an automated voice when placing calls to Plaintiff indicating it was attempting to reach the Debtor.

15. Plaintiff does not know the Debtor and is no way responsible for the repayment of the Debt.

16. On several occasions, Plaintiff informed PMAB that it was calling his personal cellular telephone and that the Debtor was unknown to him and unreachable at his telephone number.

17. Each time, Plaintiff instructed PMAB to remove his telephone number from the account and cease all communications with him.

18. However, despite knowing the Debtor could not be reached at Plaintiff’s number and ignoring Plaintiff’s multiple attempts to stop the calls, PMAB continued calling Plaintiff in an attempt to collect the Debt at an annoying and harassing rate, placing almost daily calls to his cellular telephone for successive weeks.

**C. Plaintiff Suffered Actual Damages**

19. The Plaintiff has suffered and continues to suffer actual damages as a result of the Defendants’ unlawful conduct.

20. As a direct consequence of the Defendants’ acts, practices and conduct, the Plaintiff suffered and continues to suffer from humiliation, anger, fear, frustration and embarrassment.

21. The Defendants’ conduct was so outrageous in character, and so extreme in

degree, as to go beyond all possible bounds of decency, and to be regarded as atrocious, and utterly intolerable in a civilized community.

**COUNT I**  
**VIOLATIONS OF THE FDCPA 15 U.S.C. § 1692, et seq.**

22. The Plaintiff incorporates by reference all of the above paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully stated herein.

23. The Defendants' conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692d in that Defendants engaged in behavior the natural consequence of which was to harass, oppress, or abuse the Plaintiff in connection with the collection of a debt.

24. The Defendants' conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692d(5) in that Defendants caused a phone to ring repeatedly and engaged the Plaintiff in telephone conversations, with the intent to annoy and harass.

25. The Defendants' conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692f in that Defendants used unfair and unconscionable means to collect a debt.

26. The foregoing acts and omissions of the Defendant constitute numerous and multiple violations of the FDCPA, including every one of the above-cited provisions.

27. The Plaintiff is entitled to damages as a result of Defendant's violations.

**COUNT II**  
**VIOLATIONS OF THE MARYLAND CONSUMER DEBT COLLECTION ACT**  
**MD. CODE COMM. LAW § 14-201, et seq.**

28. The Plaintiff incorporates by reference all of the above paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully stated herein.

29. The Defendants are each individually a "collector" as defined under MD. Code Comm. Law § 14-201(b).

30. The debt is a "consumer transaction" as defined under MD. Code Comm. Law

§ 14-201(c).

31. The Defendants repeatedly contacted the Plaintiff with the intent to harass or abuse, in violation of MD. Code Comm. Law § 14-202(6).

32. The Plaintiff is entitled to damages proximately caused by the Defendants' violations.

**COUNT III**  
**VIOLATIONS OF THE TELEPHONE CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT –**  
**47 U.S.C. § 227, et seq.**

33. The Plaintiff incorporates by reference all of the above paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully stated herein.

34. Plaintiff never provided his cellular telephone number to PMAB or the Creditor and never provided his consent to be contacted on his cellular telephone.

35. Without prior consent PMAB contacted the Plaintiff by means of automatic telephone calls or prerecorded messages at a cellular telephone in violation of 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1)(A)(iii).

36. Defendants continued to place automated calls to Plaintiff's cellular telephone after being advised it had the wrong number and knowing there was no consent to continue the calls. As such, each call placed to Plaintiff was made in knowing and/or willful violation of the TCPA, and subject to treble damages pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(C).

37. The telephone number called by PMAB was assigned to a cellular telephone service for which Plaintiff incurs charges for incoming calls pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1).

38. The calls from PMAB to Plaintiff were not placed for "emergency purposes" as defined by 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1)(A)(i).

39. PMAB's telephone system has the capacity to store numbers in a random and sequential manner.

40. As a result of each call made in negligent violation of the TCPA, Plaintiff is entitled to an award of \$500.00 in statutory damages for each call in violation of the TCPA pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(B).

41. As a result of each call made in knowing and/or willful violation of the TCPA, Plaintiff is entitled to an award of treble damages in an amount up to \$1,500.00 pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(B) and 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(C).

**COUNT IV**  
**INVASION OF PRIVACY BY INTRUSION UPON SECLUSION**

42. The Plaintiff incorporates by reference all of the above paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully stated herein.

43. The *Restatement of Torts, Second*, § 652(b) defines intrusion upon seclusion as, "One who intentionally intrudes...upon the solitude or seclusion of another, or his private affairs or concerns, is subject to liability to the other for invasion of privacy, if the intrusion would be highly offensive to a reasonable person."

44. Maryland further recognizes the Plaintiff's right to be free from invasions of privacy, thus Defendants violated Maryland state law.

45. The Defendants intentionally intruded upon Plaintiff's right to privacy by continually harassing the Plaintiff with the above-referenced telephone calls.

46. The telephone calls made by the Defendants to the Plaintiff were so persistent and repeated with such frequency as to be considered "hounding the plaintiff" and "a substantial burden to her existence," thus satisfying the *Restatement of Torts, Second*, § 652(b) requirement for an invasion of privacy.

47. The conduct of the Defendants in engaging in the illegal collection activities resulted in multiple invasions of privacy in such a way as would be considered highly offensive to a reasonable person.

48. As a result of the intrusions and invasions, the Plaintiff is entitled to actual damages in an amount to be determined at trial from the Defendants.

**PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

**WHEREFORE**, the Plaintiff prays that judgment be entered against the Defendants:

1. Actual damages pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a)(1) against the Defendants;
2. Statutory damages of \$1,000.00 pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a)(2)(A) against the Defendants;
3. Costs of litigation and reasonable attorney's fees pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a)(3) against the Defendants;
4. Actual damages pursuant to MD. Code Comm. Law § 14-203;
5. Actual damages pursuant to MD. Ann. Code. Bus. Reg. § 7-401(b);
6. Statutory damages pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(B) & (C);
7. Actual damages from the Defendants for the all damages suffered as a result of the intentional, reckless, and/or negligent FDCPA violations and intentional, reckless, and/or negligent invasions of privacy in an amount to be determined at trial for the Plaintiff; and
8. Such other and further relief as may be just and proper.

**TRIAL BY JURY DEMANDED ON ALL COUNTS**

Dated: March 11, 2014

Respectfully submitted,

By /s/ Sergei Lemberg  
Sergei Lemberg, Esq.  
LEMBERG & ASSOCIATES L.L.C.  
1100 Summer Street, 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor  
Stamford, CT 06905  
Telephone: (203) 653-2250  
Facsimile: (203) 653-3424  
ATTORNEYS FOR PLAINTIFF